

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12-25, and 27 are pending in this application, with claims 11 and 26 being cancelled by this Amendment. Claims 1-27 currently stand rejected, and claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 12-14, 18, 19, 22, and 24 have been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-15, 18, 20-23 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat 4,870,686 to Gerson et al. ("Gerson") in view of US Pat 6,246,986 to Ammicht et al. ("Ammicht") U.S. Patent No. 6,246,986. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

Applicants initially note that claim 1 has been amended to recite that a "user rejection or confirmation of the recognition result" may occur "**prior to** the feeding back" of the recognition result. Ammicht, which the Examiner applies for teaching a barge-in user response, discloses user feedback either **after** or **during** a prompt. See Ammicht, Col. 3, ll. 38-42; Col. 5, ll. 24-29. Ammicht is silent with regard to receiving a user confirmation or rejection before the prompt entirely; indeed, the plain language of "barge-in" requires that the user response occur after the feeding back has started, in order to "barge-in" on anything. See also, Ammicht, Col. 7, ll. 14-17 (feedback is terminated after receiving user barge-in). Thus, Ammicht does not teach or suggest the situation where a user may immediately reject input before a

system begins replaying the recognized input (e.g., before having to barge-in), upon which claim 1 reads.

Further, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of cancelled claim 11, that the user confirmation includes “reception of a next subgroup during the receiving.” Thus, in light of these amendments, claim 1 and each claim dependent therefrom recite limitations not searched or considered before or on appeal, at least not in combination.

Because Gerson, alone or in combination with Ammicht, fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 as amended, these references cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 1. Claim 13 is similarly allowable for reciting, as amended, the same unique features of claim 1 over Gerson and Ammicht. Claims 2-5, 7-8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20-23, 25, and 27 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-5, 7-8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20-23, 25, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 17, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerson in view of Ammicht, and further in view of US Pat 5,325,421 to Hou et al. (“Hou”). Hou does not cure, nor does the Examiner apply Hou for curing, the disclosure and suggestion deficiencies of Gerson and Ammicht discussed above. Specifically, Hou does not teach user confirmation or rejection before a recognition result is fed back. Because Gerson, alone or in combination with Ammicht and Hou, fails to teach or suggest each and every

element of claims 1 and 13, these references cannot anticipate or render obvious claims 1 or 13. Claims 6, 17, and 19 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 6, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerson in view of Ammicht, and further in view of publication "Investigating a Mixed Initiative Dialogue Management Strategy," 1997, to Larson ("Larson"). Larson does not cure, nor does the Examiner apply Larson for curing, the disclosure and suggestion deficiencies of Gerson and Ammicht discussed above. Specifically, Larson does not teach user confirmation or rejection before a recognition result is fed back. Because Gerson, alone or in combination with Ammicht and Larson, fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1 and 13, these references cannot anticipate or render obvious claims 1 or 13. Claims 9 and 24 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 9 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerson in view of Ammicht, and further in view of US Pat 6,269,336 to Ladd et al. ("Ladd"). Ladd does not cure, nor does the Examiner apply Ladd for curing, the disclosure and suggestion deficiencies of Gerson and Ammicht discussed above. Specifically, Ladd does not teach user confirmation or rejection before a

recognition result is fed back. Because Gerson, alone or in combination with Ammicht and Ladd, fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 13, these references cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 13. Claim 15 is allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of each of claims 1-10, 12-25, and 27 are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully Submitted,

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: 

Ryan Alley, Reg. No. 60,977
Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
703-668-8000

GDY/REA : tlt